

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS FO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.tepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/531,131	11/07/2005	Hans-Jurgen Wehner	GOTZF 146 US	4967
2355         7599         693/12009         EXAMINER           KREMBLAS, FOSTER, PHILLIPS & POLLICK         KM, JOHN K         KM, JOHN K           7632 SLATE RIDGE BOULEVARD         KM, JOHN K			MINER	
			KIM, JOHN K	
REYNOLDSE	URG, OH 43068		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2834	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/12/2009	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

officeactions@ohiopatent.com officeactions2@ohiopatent.com officeactions3@ohiopatent.com

## Application No. Applicant(s) 10/531,131 WEHNER ET AL. Interview Summary Art Unit Examiner

	JOHN K. KIM	2834					
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):							
(1) <u>JOHN K. KIM</u> .	(3)Frank H. Foster (Reg.2	<u>4560)</u> .					
(2) <u>Nguyen Hanh</u> .	(4)						
Date of Interview: <u>05 March 2009</u> .							
Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)□ Video Conference c)□ Personal (copy given to: 1)□ applicant	2) <mark> </mark>	e]					
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description:	e)⊠ No.						
Claim(s) discussed: <u>15</u> .							
Identification of prior art discussed:							
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached.	g)⊠ was not reached. h)□ N	I/A.					
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The attorney argues two issues: (1) integral cooling passage and (2) cathodic coating on motor cooling passage are not laught in cited prior arts. Re (1), the examiner disagrees the argument as diclosure and claim do not define the integral cooling passage in one solid integral body. Re (2), the examiner disagrees the argument as cited prior arts are obvious to combine for the teaching.  (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)  THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.							
/Nguyen N Hanh/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2834	March 5, 2009						